REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 13, 15-17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al., U.S. 5,003,357 (hereinafter "Kim"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 1 recites "a mount comprising a body . . . and a quantity of material attached to the body, the quantity of material forming a wall." Examples of such a device are illustrated in Fig. 2 and 4 of the present application, and paragraph 18, which teaches:

> Walls 9 of either Fig. 2 or Fig. 4 may be formed by, for example, depositing a thick film on the submount wafer during the manufacture of submount 11, then shaping the thick film to form walls 9. The film may be deposited to a thickness between about the height of device 12 plus about 25% and about ten times the height of device 12. Examples of suitable thick films are BCB available from Dow Chemical, PMMA, photoresist, glass, spin-on-glass, polyamides, and metals such as Al, Ag, Au, Pt, Pd, In, Ni, and Cr. The thick film may be spun on submount 11, plated, or deposited using any other suitable technique. The thick film may be deposited in the form of walls 9 or shaped to form walls 9 using standard photolithographic techniques such as, for example, masking and gas etching. Alternatively, walls 9 may be formed separately from submount 11 as, for example, a ring or square, then bonded to submount 11 by an adhesive such as glue or epoxy, or through the application of pressure and temperature, or by soldering, or thermosonic welding.

In contrast, Kim's device includes a light emitting device mounted in a trench formed in a Si substrate. For example, column 2 lines 8-25 state "when the Si-substrate 2 has a <100> surface plane, the V-groove can be etched through the patterned SiO_2 mask 21 in KOH solution at 80 °C or by alternative methods. For the pattern aligned to the <$\bar{1}10$> or <110> direction, the angle of etched V-groove is about 54° with respect to the substrate plane. . . . Then the light emitting device 1 is mounted on the bottom side of the groove of the silicon substrate 2 using Sn solder, Ag paste or some other electrically conductive materials." Accordingly, in Kim's device, as illustrated in Fig. 3, the groove is etched into a single piece of material such that the base of the groove and the walls of the groove are part of the same piece of material. Kim thus does not teach formed "a mount comprising a body and a quantity of material attached to the body, the quantity of material forming a wall" as recited in claim 1; therefore, claim 1 is allowable over Kim.

Claims 2-6, 8-10, 13, 15-17, and 22 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable over Kim for at least the same reason as claim 1. In addition, regarding claim 8, Applicants can find no teaching in Kim of "wherein the reflective layer comprises a dielectric stack." The Examiner cites Kim's passivation layer 11 as being claim 8's dielectric stack, however Applicants can find no teaching in Kim that passivation layer 11 is reflective, and since passivation layer 11 is covered by metal layer 9, a person of skill in the art would not expect any light to reach passivation layer 11 through metal layer 9. Claim 8 is thus allowable over Kim for this additional reason. Regarding claim 10, since Kim does not teach claim 1's quantity of material, Applicants fail to see how Kim could teach wherein the "quantity of material comprises one of BCB, PMMA, photoresist, polyamides, glass, spin-on-glass, Al, Ag, Au, Pt, Pd, In, Ni, and Cr" as recited in claim 10. Claim 10 is thus allowable over Kim for this additional reason. Regarding claims 16 and 17, Applicants have found no teaching in Kim of "a quantity of second material disposed between the device and the wall." Claims 16 and 17 are thus allowable over Kim for this additional reason.

Claims 7, 11, 12, 14, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Ishinaga U.S. 6,355,946 and Ishinaga U.S. 6,593,598. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants have found no teaching in either Ishinaga reference of "a mount comprising a body comprising silicon" as recited in claim 1. Regarding the specific elements of Ishinaga cited by the Examiner, these elements add nothing to the deficiencies of Kim with respect to claim 1, thus claims 7, 11, 12, 14, and 18-21 are allowable over Kim, Ishinaga, and Ishinaga for at least the same reason claim 1 is allowed over Kim. Regarding claim 21, Applicants respectfully dispute the Examiner's statement that "the epoxy in Ishinaga (US-6,593,598 B2) inherently has an index of refraction between about 1.4 and 1.7." A person of skill in the art would know that the index of refraction of epoxies may vary greatly and may be less than 1.4.

In view of the above arguments, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-22. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 382-0480.

Certification of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

R Leiterman 4/25/05

Signature Date

Respectfully submitted,

R Leiterman

Rachel V. Leiterman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 46,868